UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,932	06/29/2001	Michael Wayne Brown	AUS920010354US1	9404

43307 7590 06/21/2006		EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (AP) C/O AMY PATTILLO P. O. BOX 161327 AUSTIN, TX 78716		LIVERSEDGE, JENNIFER L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/895,932	BROWN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer Liversedge	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _29 June 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-35_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-35_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _29 June 2001_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) . Paper No(s)/Mail Date _6/29/2001_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 18, line 18 reference to Broker server 64 should be Broker server 54.

Page 19, line 14 reference to Specializing application 64 should be Specializing application 68.

Figures 14-16 and reference numbers there in have been mixed and incorrectly cross-referenced.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because:

Figure 1, Item 22 should be labeled "bus".

Figure 1, Item 34 should be labeled "network link".

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description:

Figure 14 and reference numbers 250 and 252 contained therein are not mentioned in the specification.

Figures 14-16 and reference numbers there in have been mixed and incorrectly cross-referenced.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next

Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 7-10, 15-18 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Pub No. U.S. 2002/0091536 A1 to Seaman et al. (further referred to as

Seaman).

Regarding claim 1, Seaman discloses a method for coordinating a plurality of

local and remote manufacturers for a manufacturing order (page 1, paragraphs 1-3),

said method comprising the steps of:

Dividing a manufacturing order for a user into a plurality of manufacturable parts

(page 1, paragraph 7); and

Submitting a local bid request for said manufacturing order to a plurality of local

manufacturers (page 1, paragraphs 6-8; page 3, paragraph 34; page 5, paragraph 42);

and

In response to receiving a plurality of local bids for said manufacturing order,

submitting a remote bid request to a plurality of remote manufacturers for a selection of

said plurality of manufacturable parts as requested in said plurality of local bids (page 3,

paragraphs 32 and 34).

Regarding claim 10, Seaman discloses a system for coordinating a.plurality of

local and remote manufacturers for a manufacturing order (page 1, paragraphs 1-3),

said method comprising:

A server system communicatively connected via a network to a plurality of local

manufacturers and a plurality of remote manufacturers (page 3, paragraphs 27-32);

Said server system comprising:

Means for dividing a manufacturing order received at said server from a user into

a plurality of manufacturable parts (page 1, paragraph 7); and

Means for submitting a local bid request from said server system for said

manufacturing order to said plurality of local manufacturers (page 1, paragraphs 6-8;

page 3, paragraph 34; page 5, paragraph 42); and

Means for submitting a remote bid request from said server system to a plurality

of remote manufacturers for a selection of said plurality of manufacturable parts as

requested in said plurality of local bids, in response to receiving a plurality of local bids

for said manufacturing order at said server system (page 3, paragraphs 32 and 34).

Regarding claim 18, Seaman discloses a program for coordinating a plurality of

local and remote manufacturers for a manufacturing order, residing on a computer

usable medium having a computer readable program code means (page 1, paragraphs

1-3; page 3, paragraphs 27-33), said program comprising:

Means for dividing a manufacturing order for a user into a plurality of

manufacturable parts (page 1, paragraph 7); and

Means for transmitting a local bid request for said manufacturing order to a

plurality of local manufacturers (page 1, paragraphs 6-8; page 3, paragraph 34; page 5,

paragraph 42); and

Means for transmitting a remote bid request to a plurality of remote

manufacturers for a selection of said plurality of manufacturable parts as requested in

said plurality of local bids, in response to receiving a plurality of local bids for said

manufacturing order (page 3, paragraphs 32 and 34).

Regarding claim 7, Seaman discloses the method further comprising the step of

compiling said plurality of local bids and said plurality of remote bids into a plurality of

selectable bid options for said user (Figure 2A; page 1, paragraphs 3 and 6-7; page 2,

paragraph 20).

Regarding claim 8, Seaman discloses the method further comprising the steps of:

Receiving a selection from said user from among said plurality of local bids and said plurality of remote bids (page 4, paragraph 36; page 7, paragraph 50);

Transferring an order request for said manufacturing order according to said selection from among said plurality of local bids and said plurality of remote bids (Figure 2C; Figures 5 and 7; page 4, paragraphs 36-37; page 5, paragraph 38).

Regarding claim 9, Seaman discloses the method further comprising the step of completing a financial settlement from said user for said order request (page 4, paragraph 35; page 5, paragraphs 38 and 40; page 6, paragraph 48; page 7, paragraph 49).

Regarding claims 15 and 23, Seaman discloses the system and program further comprising means for compiling said plurality of local bids and said plurality of remote bids into a plurality of selectable bid options for said user (Figure 2A; page 1, paragraphs 3 and 6-7; page 2, paragraph 20).

Regarding claims 16 and 24, Seaman discloses the system and program further comprising:

Means for receiving a selection from said user from among said plurality of local

bids and said plurality of remote bids at said server system (page 4, paragraph 36; page

7, paragraph 50);

Means for transferring an order request from said server system for said

manufacturing order according to said selection from among said plurality of local bids

and said plurality of remote bids (Figure 2C; Figures 5 and 7; page 4, paragraphs 36-37;

page 5, paragraph 38).

Regarding claims 17 and 25, Seaman discloses the system and program further

comprising means for completing a financial settlement from said user for said order

request (page 4, paragraph 35; page 5, paragraphs 38 and 40; page 6, paragraph 48;

page 7, paragraph 49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seaman

as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pub No. U.S. 2002/0087380 A1 to

Wang et al (further referred to as Wang).

Seaman does not disclose the method further comprising submitting said local

bid request and said remote bid request from a broker server communicatively

connected through a network to a plurality of manufacturer systems. However, Wang

discloses the method further comprising submitting said local bid request and said

remote bid request from a broker server communicatively connected through a network

to a plurality of manufacturer systems (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 12; page 2,

paragraphs 28-29; page 3, paragraph 30). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to combine the use of a broker as disclosed by Wang with the component bid

procurement system as disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would be to provide an

intermediary between buyers and sellers to coordinate the supply chain process and

allow greater flexibility in that the intermediary would provide a management

perspective on the process.

Claims 3-6, 11-14, 19-22, 26, 28, 32 and 34-35 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seaman as applied to claim 1 above, and

further in view of Patent No. 6,128,600 to Imamura et al. (further referred to as

Imamura).

Regarding claim 3, Seaman does not disclose the method and program further comprising:

facilitating said user in designing a personalized product; and

in response to receiving a request to order said personalized product, adjusting said personalized product into said manufacturing order.

However, Imamura discloses the method further comprising:

facilitating said user in designing a personalized product (column 7, lines 32-50; column 8, lines 13-21; column 9, lines 19-23 and lines 54-59); and

in response to receiving a request to order said personalized product, adjusting said personalized product into said manufacturing order (column 2, lines 33-50; column 4, lines 30-55; column 8, lines 6-13).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow for personalizing a product as disclosed by Imamura with the component bid procurement system as disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would be that frequently when an individual or organization is inquiring about purchasing an item, they desire the item to be personalized to their needs and desires. A "one-size-fits-all" approach to product sales can be restrictive in terms of product offerings.

Regarding claim 4, Seaman does not disclose the method further comprising:

In response to receiving a design request from a user, transmitting a plurality of available products to said user;

In response to receiving a product selection from among said plurality of available products, transmitting a plurality of available attributes to said user;

In response to receiving an attribute selection from among said plurality of available attributes, transmitting a plurality of available variables to said user; and

In response to receiving a variable selection from among said plurality of available variables, rendering a graphical representation of said personalized product according to said product selection, said attribute selection and said variable selection.

However, Imamura discloses the method further comprising:

In response to receiving a design request from a user, transmitting a plurality of available products to said user (column 2, lines 33-50; column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 15);

In response to receiving a product selection from among said plurality of available products, transmitting a plurality of available attributes to said user (column 7, lines 24-50; column 8, lines 1-21 and lines 54-67; column 10, line 1 – column 11, line 10);

In response to receiving an attribute selection from among said plurality of available attributes, transmitting a plurality of available variables to said user (column 7, lines 24-50; column 8, lines 1-21 and lines 54-67; column 9, lines 19-23 and lines 54-59; column 10, line 1 – column 11, line 10); and

In response to receiving a variable selection from among said plurality of available variables, rendering a graphical representation of said personalized product

according to said product selection, said attribute selection and said variable selection

(column 6, lines 6-9; column 8, lines 54-67; column 11, lines 25-39).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the defining of

user preferences through selections as disclosed by Imamura with the component bid

procurement system as disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would be that when

users are to be offered choices on design for an item, that a method for presenting and

recording such selections is required for proper and accurate manufacture of the

product based on those selections.

Regarding claim 5, Seaman does not disclose the method further comprising

calculating a cost estimate for said personalized product according to said product

selection, said attribute selection and said variable selection. However, Imamura

discloses the method further comprising calculating a cost estimate for said

personalized product according to said product selection, said attribute selection and

said variable selection (column 8, lines 54-67). It would be obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to combine providing prices on the personalized product as disclosed by

Imamura with the procurement system as disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would

be to enable to user to know the amount that the item to be procured is going to cost, in

case the personalization results in a cost which is more or less than the amount

budgeted for the item.

Regarding claim 6, Seaman does not specifically disclose the method further comprising:

analyzing said personalized design for integrity; and

in response to finding integrity flaws in said personalized design, providing said user with suggestions for adjusting said personalized design.

However, Seaman discloses "manufacturers and suppliers working together to form virtual corporations in which they work together, synchronize information, and integrate business processes for complete collaboration" (page 1, paragraph 7). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that manufacturers and suppliers working together as collaboratively as disclosed by Seaman would analyze a part for integrity and suggest modifications if flaws were found prior to actually making any parts. The motivation would be that if a supply chain network were working this closely together, what was in one portion's best interest would be in the other portion's best interest. Even in industry in which such close alliances are not formed, meetings generally referred to as Design Reviews are conducted such that the manufacturer and the supplier can discuss the component to be made, review any potential issues in the design or manufacture thereof, and make adjustments as required. This is conducted prior to beginning any manufacture of the part such as a positive and trustworthy relationship is formed and components which are useable are created.

Regarding claims 11 and 19, Seaman does not disclose the system and program further comprising:

Means for facilitating said user in designing a personalized product; and

Means for adjusting and transferring said personalized product into said

manufacturing order, in response to receiving a request to order said personalized

product.

However, Imamura discloses the system and software further comprising:

Means for facilitating said user in designing a personalized product (column 7,

lines 32-50; column 8, lines 13-21; column 9, lines 19-23 and lines 54-59); and

Means for adjusting and transferring said personalized product into said

manufacturing order, in response to receiving a request to order said personalized

product (column 2, lines 33-50; column 4, lines 30-55; column 8, lines 6-13).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow for personalizing a

product as disclosed by Imamura with the component bid procurement system as

disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would be that frequently when an individual or

organization is inquiring about purchasing an item, they desire the item to be

personalized to their needs and desires. A "one-size-fits-all" approach to product sales

can be restrictive in terms of product offerings.

Regarding claims 12 and 20, Seaman does not disclose the system and program

further comprising:

Means for transmitting a plurality of available products to said user from said

server system, in response to receiving a design request from a user;

Means for transmitting a plurality of available attributes to said user from said server system, in response to receiving a product selection from among said plurality of available products;

Means for transmitting a plurality of available variables to said user from said server system, in response to receiving an attribute selection from among said plurality of available attributes; and

Means for rendering a graphical representation of said personalized product according to said product selection from said server system, said attribute selection and said variable selection, in response to receiving a variable selection from among said plurality of available variables.

However, Imamura discloses the system and program further comprising:

Means for transmitting a plurality of available products to said user from said server system, in response to receiving a design request from a user (column 2, lines 33-50; column 3, line 66 – column 4, line 15);

Means for transmitting a plurality of available attributes to said user from said server system, in response to receiving a product selection from among said plurality of available products (column 7, lines 24-50; column 8, lines 1-21 and lines 54-67; column 10, line 1 – column 11, line 10);

Means for transmitting a plurality of available variables to said user from said server system, in response to receiving an attribute selection from among said plurality of available attributes (column 7, lines 24-50; column 8, lines 1-21 and lines 54-67; column 9, lines 19-23 and lines 54-59; column 10, line 1 – column 11, line 10); and

Means for rendering a graphical representation of said personalized product

according to said product selection from said server system, said attribute selection and

said variable selection, in response to receiving a variable selection from among said

plurality of available variables (column 6, lines 6-9; column 8, lines 54-67; column 11,

lines 25-39).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the defining of

user preferences through selections as disclosed by Imamura with the component bid

procurement system as disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would be that when

users are to be offered choices on design for an item, that a method for presenting and

recording such selections is required for proper and accurate manufacture of the

product based on those selections.

Regarding claims 13 and 21, Seaman does not disclose the system and program

further comprising means for calculating a cost estimate for said personalized product

according to said product selection, said attribute selection and said variable selection.

However, Imamura discloses the system and program further comprising calculating a

cost estimate for said personalized product according to said product selection, said

attribute selection and said variable selection (column 8, lines 54-67). It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine providing prices on the

personalized product as disclosed by Imamura with the procurement system as

disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would be to enable to user to know the amount

that the item to be procured is going to cost, in case the personalization results in a cost

which is more or less than the amount budgeted for the item.

Regarding claims 14 and 22, Seaman does not specifically disclose the system

and program further comprising:

Means for analyzing said personalized design for integrity; and

Means for providing and notifying said user with suggestions for adjusting said

personalized design, in response to finding integrity flaws in said personalized design.

However, Seaman discloses "manufacturers and suppliers working together to

form virtual corporations in which they work together, synchronize information, and

integrate business processes for complete collaboration" (page 1, paragraph 7). It

would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that manufacturers and suppliers

working together as collaboratively as disclosed by Seaman would analyze a part for

integrity and suggest modifications if flaws were found prior to actually making any

parts. The motivation would be that if a supply chain network were working this closely

together, what was in one portion's best interest would be in the other portion's best

interest. Even in industry in which such close alliances are not formed, meetings

generally referred to as Design Reviews are conducted such that the manufacturer and

the supplier can discuss the component to be made, review any potential issues in the

design or manufacture thereof, and make adjustments as required. This is conducted

prior to beginning any manufacture of the part such as a positive and trustworthy

relationship is formed and components which are useable are created.

Regarding claim 26, Seaman discloses a method for customizing bids for a

product, said method comprising the steps of:

Receiving a bid request for a product at a local manufacturer, wherein said bid

request comprises a plurality of manufacturable parts (page 1, paragraphs 6-8; page 3,

paragraphs 32 and 34; page 5, paragraph 42); and

Returning a bid offer for said product specifying a selection of said plurality of

manufacturable parts to be provided by a remote manufacturer, such that said local

manufacturer customizes said bid offer for said product (page 3, paragraphs 32 and 34).

Seaman does not disclose where the product is personalized. However,

Imamura discloses where the product is personalized (column 7, lines 32-50; column 8,

lines 13-21; column 9, lines 19-23 and lines 54-59. It would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to allow for personalizing a product as disclosed by Imamura with

the component bid procurement system as disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would

be that frequently when an individual or organization is inquiring about purchasing an

item, they desire the item to be personalized to their needs and desires. A "one-size-

fits-all" approach to product sales can be restrictive in terms of product offerings.

Regarding claim 28, Seaman discloses the method further comprising the step of

requiring an option to select from among a plurality of bids for said selection of said

plurality of manufacturable parts from a plurality of remote manufacturers (Figure 2A;

page 1, paragraphs 3 and 6-7; page 2, paragraph 20).

Regarding claim 32, Seaman discloses a program for customizing bids for a product, residing on a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means (page 3, paragraphs 27-33), said system comprising:

Means for receiving a bid request for a product at a local manufacturer, wherein said bid request comprises a plurality of manufacturable parts (page 1, paragraphs 6-8; page 3, paragraphs 32 and 34; page 5, paragraph 42); and

Means for returning a bid offer for said product specifying a selection of said plurality of manufacturable parts to be provided by a remote manufacturer, such that said local manufacturer customizes said bid offer for said product (page 3, paragraphs 32 and 34).

Seaman does not disclose where the product is personalized. However, Imamura discloses where the product is personalized (column 7, lines 32-50; column 8, lines 13-21; column 9, lines 19-23 and lines 54-59. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow for personalizing a product as disclosed by Imamura with the component bid procurement system as disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would be that frequently when an individual or organization is inquiring about purchasing an item, they desire the item to be personalized to their needs and desires. A "one-size-fits-all" approach to product sales can be restrictive in terms of product offerings.

Regarding claim 34, Seaman discloses the program further comprising means for requiring an option to select from among a plurality of bids for said selection of said

plurality of manufacturable parts from a plurality of remote manufacturers (Figure 2A;

page 1, paragraphs 3 and 6-7; page 2, paragraph 20).

Regarding claim 35, Seaman discloses a method for procuring manufacturers,

said method comprising the steps of:

Facilitating a user entry of a design; and procuring at least one remote

manufacturer for manufacturing a particular portion of a design order, such that a local

manufacturer is enabled to manufacture and assemble said design utilizing said

particular portion manufactured by said at least one remote manufacturer (page 1,

paragraphs 1-3 and 6-7; page 2, paragraph 10; page 3, paragraphs 32-34).

Seaman does not disclose where the design is personalized. However, Imamura

discloses where the design in personalized (column 7, lines 32-50; column 8, lines 13-

21; column 9, lines 19-23 and lines 54-59). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art to allow for personalizing a product as disclosed by Imamura with the

component bid procurement system as disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would be

that frequently when an individual or organization is inquiring about purchasing an item,

they desire the item to be personalized to their needs and desires. A "one-size-fits-all"

approach to product sales can be restrictive in terms of product offerings.

Claims 27, 29-31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Seaman and Imamura, and further in view of Wang.

Regarding claim 29, Seaman discloses a system for customizing bids for a

product, said system comprising:

A manufacturer server system communicatively connected via a network to a

server system enabled to receive a bid request from a user (page 3, paragraphs 27-33);

Said manufacturer server system comprising:

Means for receiving said bid request for a product at a local manufacturer,

wherein said bid request comprises a plurality of manufacturable parts (page 1,

paragraphs 6-8; page 3, paragraphs 32 and 34; page 5, paragraph 42); and

Means for returning a bid offer for said product specifying a selection of said

plurality of manufacturable parts to be provided by a remote manufacturer, such that

said local manufacturer customizes said bid offer for said product (page 3, paragraphs

32 and 34).

Seaman does not disclose where the product is personalized. However,

Imamura discloses where the product is personalized (column 7, lines 32-50; column 8,

lines 13-21; column 9, lines 19-23 and lines 54-59. It would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to allow for personalizing a product as disclosed by Imamura with

the component bid procurement system as disclosed by Seaman. The motivation would

be that frequently when an individual or organization is inquiring about purchasing an

item, they desire the item to be personalized to their needs and desires. A "one-size-

fits-all" approach to product sales can be restrictive in terms of product offerings.

Neither Seaman nor Imamura disclose a broker server. However, Wang

discloses a broker server (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 12; page 2, paragraphs 28-29;

page 3, paragraph 30). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of a broker as disclosed by Wang with the component bid procurement system as disclosed by Seaman and Imamura. The motivation would be to provide an intermediary between buyers and sellers to coordinate the supply chain process and allow greater flexibility in that the intermediary would provide a management perspective on the process.

Regarding claims 27, 30 and 33, Seaman discloses the method, system and program further comprising receiving said bid request at a local manufacturer system communicatively connected to a network with a server comprising means for receiving requests from users (page 3, paragraphs 27-33). Neither Seaman nor Imamura disclose a broker server. However, Wang discloses a broker server (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 12; page 2, paragraphs 28-29; page 3, paragraph 30). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of a broker as disclosed by Wang with the component bid procurement system as disclosed by Seaman and Imamura. The motivation would be to provide an intermediary between buyers and sellers to coordinate the supply chain process and allow greater flexibility in that the intermediary would provide a management perspective on the process.

Regarding claim 31, Seaman discloses the system further comprising means for requiring an option to select from among a plurality of bids for said selection of said

plurality of manufacturable parts from a plurality of remote manufacturers (Figure 2A;

page 1, paragraphs 3 and 6-7; page 2, paragraph 20).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jennifer

Liversedge whose telephone number is 571-272-3167. The examiner can normally be

reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 – 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Sam Sough can be reached at 571-272-6799. The fax number for the

organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer Liversedge

Examiner

**FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Art Unit 3628